arXiv:1605.04301v1 [math.CO] 13 May 2016

GENERALISED RAMSEY NUMBERS FOR TWO SETS OF CYCLES

MIKAEL HANSSON

Abstract. We determine several generalised Ramsey numbers for two sets Γ_1 and Γ_2 of cycles, in particular, all generalised Ramsey numbers $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ such that Γ_1 or Γ_2 contains a cycle of length at most 6, or the shortest cycle in each set is even. This generalises previous results of Erdős, Faudree, Rosta, Rousseau, and Schelp from the 1970s. Notably, including both C_3 and C_4 in one of the sets, makes very little difference from including only C_4. Furthermore, we give a conjecture for the general case. We also describe many (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding graphs, including a complete characterisation of most (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs, i.e., (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding graphs on $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) - 1$ vertices, such that Γ_1 or Γ_2 contains a cycle of length at most 5. For length 4, this is an easy extension of a recent result of Wu, Sun, and Radziszowski, in which $|\Gamma_1| = |\Gamma_2| = 1$. For lengths 3 and 5, our results are new even in this special case.

Keywords: generalised Ramsey number, critical graph, cycle, set of cycles

1. Introduction

All graphs in this paper are finite, simple, and undirected. Furthermore, (G_1, G_2) and $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ will always denote a pair of non-empty (uncoloured) graphs and a pair of non-empty sets of non-empty (uncoloured) graphs, respectively. Notation will generally follow [2].

Here, a *red-blue graph* is a *complete* graph with each edge coloured either red or blue. Red will always be the first colour and blue will always be the second.

Generalised Ramsey numbers for two sets of graphs were, to the best of the author's knowledge, first introduced by Erdős, Faudree, Rousseau, and Schelp [3, 5]:

Definition 1.1. The *generalised Ramsey number* $R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is the least positive integer n, such that each red-blue graph on n vertices contains a red subgraph from $\mathcal{G}_1$ or a blue subgraph from $\mathcal{G}_2$.

Note that when $|\mathcal{G}_1| = |\mathcal{G}_2| = 1$, the generalised Ramsey number $R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ reduces to the ordinary Ramsey number $R(G_1, G_2)$. It is easy to see that $R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \leq R(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2)$ if each $\mathcal{H}_i$ is a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{G}_i$. Thus

$$R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \leq R(G_1, G_2) \tag{1.1}$$

if each $G_i \in \mathcal{G}_i$. In particular, $R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ always exists. Clearly, $R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) = R(\mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_1)$.

Let G be a red-blue graph. Then G is called $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$-*avoiding* if G contains neither a red subgraph from $\mathcal{G}_1$ nor a blue subgraph from $\mathcal{G}_2$, and $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$-*critical* if, moreover, G has $R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) - 1$ vertices. The *red subgraph* G_{red} of G is the (uncoloured) graph $(V(G), \{e \in E(G) \mid e \text{ is red}\})$; the *blue subgraph* G_{blue} is defined analogously. When we say that G is red hamiltonian, blue bipartite, etc., we mean that G_{red} is hamiltonian, G_{blue} is bipartite, and so on. Further terminology will be introduced in Section 2.

Let (Γ_1, Γ_2) be a pair of non-empty sets of cycles. The main results of this paper can be divided into two groups: computation of generalised Ramsey numbers $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ on the one hand, and characterisation of (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding and (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs on the other.

1.1. **Previous results.** We first present some results which, to the best of the author's knowledge, include all previously known generalised Ramsey numbers for two sets of cycles. To this end, and for stating the main results of this paper, let $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}_o$, $\mathcal{C}_e$, and $\mathfrak{C}$ denote the set of all cycles, the set of all odd cycles, the set of all even cycles, and the set of all pairs of non-empty sets of cycles, respectively. Also, for each integer $m \geq 3$, let $\mathcal{C}_{\leq m} = \{C_k \mid k \leq m\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\geq m} = \{C_k \mid k \geq m\}$. Furthermore, given $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, let

$$\min(\Gamma) = \begin{cases} \min\{k \mid C_k \in \Gamma\} & \text{if } \Gamma \text{ is non-empty,} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and if $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$, then for each $i \in [2]$, let $\gamma^i = \min(\Gamma_i)$ and $\gamma^i_e = \min(\Gamma_i \cap \mathcal{C}_e)$.

When $|\Gamma_1| = |\Gamma_2| = 1$, the (ordinary) Ramsey numbers $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ were determined independently by Rosta [9] and by Faudree and Schelp [4]. A new proof, simpler but still quite technical and detailed, was given by Károlyi and Rosta [8]. Here we state the theorem in a way that will be useful to us later. To this end, let Δ_1, Δ_2, and Δ_3 be the sets of all pairs (n, k) of integers with $n \geq k \geq 3$, such that

Δ_1: $k \equiv 0$ and either $0 \equiv n \geq 6$ or $n \geq 3k/2$;
Δ_2: $k \equiv 0$ and $1 \equiv n \leq 3k/2$;
Δ_3: $k \equiv 1$ and $n \geq 4$.

Here, and henceforth, all congruences are modulo 2.

Theorem 1.2 ([9] and [4])**.** *Let $n \geq k \geq 3$. Then*

$$R(C_n, C_k) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } (n,k) \in \{(3,3),(4,4)\}, \\ n + k/2 - 1 & \text{if } (n,k) \in \Delta_1, \\ 2k - 1 & \text{if } (n,k) \in \Delta_2, \\ 2n - 1 & \text{if } (n,k) \in \Delta_3. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we have the following two results of Erdős, Faudree, Rousseau, and Schelp, from which we obtain Corollary 1.5.

Theorem 1.3 ([3, Theorem 3])**.** *For all $m > n \geq 2$,*

$$R(\mathcal{C}_{\leq m}, \{K_n\}) = \begin{cases} 2n & \text{if } n < m < 2n - 1, \\ 2n - 1 & \text{if } m \geq 2n - 1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.4 ([5, Theorem 2])**.** *For all $m \geq 3$ and all $n \geq 2$,*

$$R(\mathcal{C}_{\geq m}, \{K_n\}) = (m-1)(n-1) + 1.$$

Corollary 1.5. *For all $m \geq 3$,*

$$R(\mathcal{C}_{\leq m}, \{C_3\}) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } m \leq 4, \\ 5 & \text{if } m \geq 5, \end{cases}$$

and

$$R(\mathcal{C}_{\geq m}, \{C_3\}) = 2m - 1.$$

Let us turn to a structural result, due to Wu, Sun, and Radziszowski [10]. In order to state it, we have to define some sets of graphs. Given a graph G, a vertex $v \in V(G)$, a subset $U \subseteq V(G)$, and an edge $e \in E(G)$, let $N(v)$, $d(v)$, $G[U]$, and $G - e$ denote the set of neighbours of v, the number of neighbours of v, the induced subgraph on U, and the graph G with the edge e deleted, respectively. We say that G has a *matching on* U if each vertex in U has degree at most 1 in $G[U]$.

Definition 1.6. Let $n \geq 6$. For each $i \in [3]$, let $\mathcal{G}_i$ be a set of graphs on $\{v\} \cup X \cup \{y\}$ with $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}\}$, as follows:

- $\mathcal{G}_1$ consists of the graphs with $N(v) = X$, having a matching on $X \cup \{y\}$;
- $\mathcal{G}_2$ consists of the graphs with $N(v) = X$, $N(y) = \{x_{n-2}\}$, and $d(x_{n-2}) = 3$, having a matching on X;
- $\mathcal{G}_3$ consists of the graphs with $N(v) = X \cup \{y\}$, having a matching on $X \cup \{y\}$.

See [10, Figure 1] for pictures illustrating these graph sets.

We can now state the structural result:

Theorem 1.7 ([10, Theorem 1])**.** *Let $n \geq 6$. Then G is (C_n, C_4)-critical if and only if $G_{\text{blue}} \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{G}_3$.*

1.2. **Main results.** Recall that γ^i and γ^i_e denote the length of the shortest cycle and the length of the shortest even cycle, respectively, in Γ_i. We shall later (in Subsection 3.1) define a number $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, and we shall prove that

$$\mathfrak{m} = \max\big(5, \min(\gamma^2 + \gamma^1_e/2 - 1, 2\gamma^2 - 1), \min(\gamma^1 + \gamma^2_e/2 - 1, 2\gamma^1 - 1)\big).$$

Recall also that $\mathfrak{C}$ is the set of all pairs of non-empty sets of cycles, and let $\mathscr{C} = \{(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C} \mid C_3 \text{ or } C_4 \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 \text{ and } C_3 \text{ or } C_5 \notin \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2\}$. Observe that $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = 5$ if $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathscr{C}$.

We are now ready to state the first of two main results of this paper:

Theorem 1.8. *Let $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) + 1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathscr{C}, \\ \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover, equality holds if either $\min(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) \leq 6$ or $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}_1 \cup \mathfrak{C}_2$.

We shall prove Theorem 1.8 in Subsection 4.1. The definitions of $\mathfrak{C}_1$ and $\mathfrak{C}_2$ are slightly involved; they will be given before Proposition 4.1, in which they are needed. However, an easily stated special case is the following:

Corollary 1.9. *Equality holds in* (1.2) *for all pairs* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *such that both* γ^1 *and* γ^2 *are even.*

Choose $\Gamma_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\geq 5}$ arbitrarily, and let $R_1 = R(\Gamma_1, \{C_4\} \cup \Gamma_2)$ and $R_2 = R(\Gamma_1, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 4} \cup \Gamma_2)$. Since equality holds in (1.2) if $\min(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) \leq 6$, we have the following:

Corollary 1.10. *Let* Γ_1, Γ_2, R_1, *and* R_2 *be as above. Then* $R_1 = R_2$ *whenever* $\gamma^1 \geq 6$*; in particular,* $R(C_n, C_4) = R(\{C_n\}, \mathcal{C}_{\leq 4})$ *whenever* $n \geq 6$.

Hence, including both C_3 and C_4 in one of the sets, rarely makes any difference from including only C_4. This is perhaps quite unintuitive. Using Theorem 1.8, it is possible to determine precisely under what conditions $R_1 = R_2$; we refrain from doing this here.

For all pairs (Γ_1, Γ_2) such that equality holds in (1.2), note that since $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ only depends on γ^1, γ^1_e, γ^2, and γ^2_e, so does $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, unless $(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \in \{(3,3), (4,3), (3,4)\}$.

Before we turn to the structural results, let us state a conjecture:

Conjecture 1.11. Equality holds in (1.2) for all pairs $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$.

Let $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ with $\gamma^1 \geq 6$ and $\gamma^2 = 4$, and let $n = \gamma^1$. Then, since $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = n + 1 = R(C_n, C_4)$, and none of the graphs in $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{G}_3$ contains a cycle of length at least 4 or has a cycle of length at least n in its complement, the following result is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.7.

Theorem 1.12. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $\gamma^1 \geq 6$ *and* $\gamma^2 = 4$*, and let* $n = \gamma^1$*. Then* G *is* (Γ_1, Γ_2)*-critical if and only if* $G_{\text{blue}} \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{G}_3$.

We shall prove a similar result when $\gamma^2 \in \{3, 5\}$, which is the second main result of this paper. Here we state an abridged version.

Theorem 1.13 (abridged version of Theorem 4.11)**.** *Given* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *and a* (Γ_1, Γ_2)*-critical graph* G*, assume that either*

$$\gamma^1 \geq 5 \text{ and } \gamma^2 = 3 \tag{1.3}$$

or

$$\gamma^1 \geq 6,\ \gamma^2 = 5, \text{ and } \gamma^2_e \geq 8. \tag{1.4}$$

Then G *is blue bipartite.*

Theorem 4.11 will give us a complete characterisation of the (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs that satisfy (1.3) or (1.4). It is stated and proved in Subsection 4.2. From Theorem 4.11, we easily obtain the following result, which characterises (C_n, C_3)- and (C_n, C_5)-critical graphs, and is the analogue of Theorem 1.7. Note that there are a lot fewer possibilities for the critical graphs, compared to the situation in Theorem 1.7.

Corollary 1.14.

(a) *Let* $n \geq 5$*. Then* G *is* (C_n, C_3)*-critical if and only if* $G_{\text{blue}} = K_{n-1,n-1}$ *or* $K_{n-1,n-1} - e$ *for some edge* e.

(b) *Let $n \geq 6$. Then G is (C_n, C_5)-critical if and only if $G_{\text{blue}} = K_{n-1,n-1}$ or $K_{n-1,n-1} - e$ for some edge e.*

Remark. In particular, for $n \geq 6$, a graph is (C_n, C_3)-critical precisely when it is (C_n, C_5)-critical.

We pose the following question:

Question 1.15. Let $n \geq k \geq 3$, where k is odd and $(n,k) \neq (3,3)$. For which pairs (n,k) is it true that G is (C_n, C_k)-critical if and only if $G_{\text{blue}} = K_{n-1,n-1}$ or $K_{n-1,n-1} - e$ for some edge e? Is it true for all of them?

After a short section on notation and conventions (Section 2), the paper is organised as follows. In Section 3, we define some colourings that we shall need later, and some numbers from which $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ stems. We also prove some preparatory results. Then, in Section 4, we prove the two main results of this paper. Subsection 4.1 is devoted to computation of generalised Ramsey numbers (thus establishing Theorem 1.8), while Subsection 4.2 deals with characterisation of (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding and (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs (in particular, Theorem 4.11).

2. Notation and conventions

A graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices is called *hamiltonian* if it contains a cycle of length n (an *n-cycle*), and *pancyclic* if it contains cycles of every length between 3 and n. Vertex indices will always be interpreted modulo the length of the cycle that we are considering at the moment. For instance, $x_{11} = x_3$ in a cycle of length 8. When we consider two vertices x_i and x_{i+j} of a cycle $C = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n x_1$, we shall assume that $0 \leq j \leq n-1$. A *j-chord* of C is an edge of the form $x_i x_{i+j}$, where $2 \leq j \leq n-2$.

Let G be a red-blue graph. Two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ are called *red adjacent* to each other, or *red neighbours*, if the edge uv is red; *blue adjacent* is defined analogously. If $U \subseteq V(G)$, let $G[U]$ denote the induced subgraph on U with the induced colouring. Also, if $H = G[U]$ and $U' \subseteq V(G)$, let $H - U' = G[U - U']$, and if $v \in V(G)$, let $H - v = H - \{v\}$. When there is no risk of ambiguity, we write $v \in G$ and $|G|$ instead of $v \in V(G)$ and $|V(G)|$, respectively.

3. Preliminaries

In this section, we first define some colourings that will be needed in the proofs to come. We then define bipartite versions of Ramsey numbers, and compute them for any sets of cycles. They turn out to be closely related to generalised Ramsey numbers (see Theorem 1.8). Finally, we state and prove a number of lemmas. They will be used in the proofs of Propositions 4.1, 4.4, and 4.7, which establish Theorem 1.8 when $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}_1 \cup \mathfrak{C}_2$, $\gamma^1 \geq 5$ and $\gamma^2 = 3$, and $\gamma^1 \geq 6$ and $\gamma^2 = 5$, respectively.

We shall need the following colourings:

Colouring 1: The red-blue graph on 4 vertices whose red (and blue) subgraph is a path of length 3.



FIGURE 3.1. Colourings 1, 2, and 3.

Colouring 2: The red-blue graph on 5 vertices whose red (and blue) subgraph has vertex degrees 1, 1, 2, 3, and 3.

Colouring 3: The red-blue graph on 5 vertices whose red (and blue) subgraph is a cycle of length 5.

Colouring 4: The red-blue graph on $n+k/2-2$ vertices, with $n \geq k/2$ and k even, whose blue subgraph equals $K_{n-1,k/2-1}$.

Colouring 5: The red-blue graph on $2k-2$ vertices whose red subgraph equals $K_{k-1,k-1}$.

Colouring 6: The red-blue graph on $2n-2$ vertices whose blue subgraph equals $K_{n-1,n-1}$.

Note that Colourings 3, 4, 5, and 6 were used to prove the lower bounds in Theorem 1.2 (see [4] or [9]).

3.1. **Bipartite versions of Ramsey numbers.**

Definition 3.1. Let $R_{\text{red}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ be the least positive integer n, such that each red bipartite graph on n vertices contains a red subgraph from $\mathcal{G}_1$ or a blue subgraph from $\mathcal{G}_2$; $R_{\text{blue}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ is defined analogously.

Observe that

$$R_{\text{red}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) = R(\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_o, \mathcal{G}_2) \leq R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$$

and

$$R_{\text{blue}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) = R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2 \cup \mathcal{C}_o) \leq R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2).$$

In particular, $R_{\text{red}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ and $R_{\text{blue}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ always exist. Moreover, the following fact, which we shall use frequently, follows:

$$R(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \geq \max\big(R_{\text{red}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2), R_{\text{blue}}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)\big). \tag{3.1}$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$. *Then*

$$R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \begin{cases} \gamma^1 + \gamma_e^2/2 - 1 & \text{if } 2\gamma^1 > \gamma_e^2 \text{ and } (\gamma^1, \gamma_e^2) \neq (3,4), \\ 2\gamma^1 - 1 & \text{if } 2\gamma^1 \leq \gamma_e^2 \text{ or } (\gamma^1, \gamma_e^2) = (3,4), \end{cases} \tag{3.2}$$

or equivalently,

$$R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \begin{cases} 5 & \text{if } (\gamma^1, \gamma_e^2) = (3,4), \\ \min(\gamma^1 + \gamma_e^2/2 - 1, 2\gamma^1 - 1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remarks. Of course, the analogous result holds for $R_{\text{red}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$. Furthermore, one can extend the definition of $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ to include the case $\Gamma_2 = \emptyset$, and (3.2) will still hold (note that $\gamma^2 = \gamma_e^2 = \infty$). Also note that $\gamma^1 + \gamma_e^2/2 - 1 = 2\gamma^1 - 1$ when $2\gamma^1 = \gamma_e^2$.

Proof. In order to simplify notation, let $n = \gamma^1$ and $k = \gamma^2_e$. Let us first prove the lower bounds.

$2n > k$: Colouring 4 is blue bipartite on $n+k/2-2$ vertices, and contains no red cycle of length at least n, no blue cycle of length at least k, and no odd blue cycle. Hence, $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq n + k/2 - 1$.

$2n \leq k$ or $(n, k) = (3, 4)$: Colouring 6 is blue bipartite on $2n-2$ vertices, and contains no red cycle of length at least n, no blue cycle of length at least k, and no odd blue cycle. Hence, $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq 2n - 1$ when $2n \leq k$. When $(n, k) = (3, 4)$, the lower bound follows from Colouring 1.

We now turn to the upper bounds. Let G be an arbitrary blue bipartite graph on $2n-1$ vertices; say that $G_{\text{blue}} \subseteq K_{p,q}$, where $p+q = 2n-1$. Then $\max(p, q) \geq n$, whence G contains a red C_n. Hence, we only have to consider the case when $2n > k$ and $(n, k) \neq (3, 4)$.

Since $2n > k$ and $(n, k) \neq (3, 4)$, $n \geq 4$. Let G be an arbitrary blue bipartite graph on $n+k/2-1$ vertices; say that $G_{\text{blue}} \subseteq K_{p,q}$, where $p+q = n + k/2 - 1$ and $p \geq q$, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Were $p \geq n$, G would contain a red C_n, whence $q \geq k/2$. Since G contains no blue C_k, there is at least one red edge between the red K_p and the red K_q. Were there two disjoint red edges between K_p and K_q, G would contain a red C_n (since $n \geq 4$), whence all red edges between K_p and K_q have a common vertex x. Since G contains no blue C_k, it follows that $q = k/2$ and $p = n-1$.

Assume first that $x \in K_{k/2}$. Were there at least two red edges between K_{n-1} and x, G would contain a red C_n, whence there is only one red edge between K_{n-1} and x. Hence, there are at least two blue edges between K_{n-1} and x (since $n \geq 4$), say v_1x and v_2x, and v_1xv_2 can then be extended to a blue C_k, contrary to the hypothesis.

Assume now that $x \in K_{n-1}$. Then all edges between $K_{n-1} - x$ and $K_{k/2}$ are blue, whence G contains a blue C_k, unless $n-1 = k/2$, in which case $x \in K_{k/2}$ (which we have already treated). □

Given $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$, let

$$\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \max\big(R_{\text{red}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2), R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)\big).$$

The following result is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.2.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$. Then*

$$\mathfrak{m} = \max\big(5, \min(\gamma^2 + \gamma^1_e/2 - 1, 2\gamma^2 - 1), \min(\gamma^1 + \gamma^2_e/2 - 1, 2\gamma^1 - 1)\big).$$

3.2. **Preparatory results.** The following three lemmas, due to Károlyi and Rosta [8], guarantee the existence of certain monochromatic cycles under various assumptions. They will be used in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Lemma 3.4 ([8, Lemma 3.1])**.** *Let G be a red-blue graph on $n + k/2 - 1$ vertices, where $n \geq k \geq 4$, $n \geq 5$, and $k \equiv 0$. Then G contains either a monochromatic cycle of length at least n or a blue C_k.*

Remark. Of course, if G contains no monochromatic cycle of length at least n, then we also have a red C_k. However, we only need the lemma as stated above.

Lemma 3.5 ([8, Lemma 2.1])**.** *Let G be a red-blue graph.*

(a) *If G contains a monochromatic C_{2n+1} for some $n \geq 3$, then G contains a monochromatic C_{2n}.*
(b) *If G contains a monochromatic C_{2n} for some $n \geq 3$, then G contains a monochromatic C_{2n-2}.*

Lemma 3.6 (special case of [8, Lemma 3.3])**.** *Let $n \geq k \geq 4$ with $k \equiv 0$. If a red-blue graph contains a blue C_n, then it contains either a red C_n or a blue C_k.*

The following two results will be used in the proof of Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 3.7. *Let G be a red-blue graph on n vertices without blue 3-cycles. Then G is either red hamiltonian or blue bipartite.*

Proof. We use induction on n. If $n \leq 4$, then G is blue bipartite. Assume now that the statement holds for some $n \geq 4$, and let $|G| = n + 1$. If G is not blue bipartite, let $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_{2m+1}x_1$ be a shortest odd blue cycle in G; note that $m \geq 2$.

Were some chord of C blue, G would contain an odd blue cycle shorter than C, whence all chords of C are red. In particular, the m-chords of C form a red C_{2m+1}. If $V(C) = V(G)$, this is a red C_{n+1}. If not, take $x \in G - V(C)$. By the induction hypothesis, $G - x$ has a red C_n, say $v_1v_2 \cdots v_nv_1$.

Assume G is not red hamiltonian. Suppose xv_i and xv_j are red; note that $|i - j| \geq 2$. If $v_{i+1}v_{j+1}$ is red, then G has a red C_{n+1}. Hence, G contains a blue d-clique, where d is the number of red neighbours of x. Therefore, since G contains no blue C_3, $d \leq 2$. Hence, x is blue adjacent to two consecutive vertices of C, yielding a blue C_3, a contradiction. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let G be a red-blue graph and let $n \geq 6$. If G contains an n-cycle C, all of whose chords are red, then $G[V(C)]$ is red pancyclic.*

In order to get a short proof, we use the following result of Bondy.

Lemma 3.9 ([1, Theorem 1])**.** *Let G be hamiltonian with n vertices and at least $n^2/4$ edges. Then either G is pancyclic or $G = K_{n/2,n/2}$.*

Proof of Lemma 3.8. Let $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_nx_1$. Then

$$x_1x_3 \cdots x_nx_2x_4 \cdots x_{n-1}x_1$$

is a red C_n if n is odd, and

$$x_1x_3 \cdots x_{n-1}x_2x_nx_{n-2} \cdots x_4x_1$$

is a red C_n if n is even. Since $x_1x_3x_5x_1$ is a red C_3, G is not red bipartite. Hence, it follows from Lemma 3.9 that $G[V(C)]$ is red pancyclic. □

Our next result essentially proves Proposition 4.7.

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose G_{blue} contains an odd cycle but no 5-cycle. Then G_{red} contains cycles of every length in the interval $[6, |G| - 2]$.*

In order to prove it, we need the following three lemmas.

Lemma 3.11. *If G_{blue} contains no 5-cycle and G_{red} has an n-cycle, where $n \geq 5$, then G_{red} has an $(n-1)$-cycle or an $(n-2)$-cycle.*

Remark. The assumption on n is clearly necessary.

Proof. Let C be a red C_n. If C has a red 2-chord or 3-chord, then we have a red C_{n-1} or C_{n-2}, respectively. Otherwise we have a blue C_5. □

Lemma 3.12. *If G_{blue} contains no 5-cycle and G_{red} has an n-cycle, where $7 \leq n \leq |G| - 1$, then G_{red} has an $(n-1)$-cycle.*

Remark. The red-blue graph whose red subgraph equals $K_{4,4}$ shows that the conditions $n \geq 7$ and $n \leq |G| - 1$ cannot be omitted.

Proof. Let $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_nx_1$ be a red C_n, and take $x \in G - V(C)$. If C has a red 2-chord, then we have a red C_{n-1}, so suppose all 2-chords are blue. Then, if G contains no blue C_5, x is red adjacent to some vertex of C. Hence, either there is an $i \in [n]$ such that xx_i and xx_{i+3} are red, or there is an $i \in [n]$ such that xx_i and xx_{i+6} are blue. In the former case, we have a red C_{n-1}, and in the latter case, we have a blue C_5. □

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose G_{blue} contains no 5-cycle, $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_nx_1$ is a red n-cycle, and $x \in G - V(C)$. If there is a $j \in \{1\} \cup [3, n-3] \cup \{n-1\}$, such that for some $i \in [n]$, xx_i and xx_{i+j} are red, then G contains a red $(n+1)$-cycle.*

Proof. This is clear if $j \in \{1, n-1\}$, so take $j \in [3, n-3]$. In order to obtain a contradiction, suppose G does not contain a red C_{n+1}. Since $j \in [3, n-3]$, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, x_{i+j-1}, x_{i+j}, and x_{i+j+1} are all distinct, and since G contains no red C_{n+1}, x is blue adjacent to x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, x_{i+j-1}, and x_{i+j+1}. Were $x_{i-1}x_{i+j-1}$ or $x_{i+1}x_{i+j+1}$ red,

$$x_{i-1}x_{i+j-1}x_{i+j-2} \cdots x_ixx_{i+j}x_{i+j+1} \cdots x_{i-1}$$

or

$$x_{i+1}x_{i+j+1}x_{i+j+2} \cdots x_ixx_{i+j}x_{i+j-1} \cdots x_{i+1},$$

respectively, would be a red C_{n+1}, whence $x_{i-1}x_{i+j-1}$ and $x_{i+1}x_{i+j+1}$ are blue. Since G contains no blue C_5, $x_{i-1}x_{i+1}$ is red. Were x_ix_{i+j-1} and x_ix_{i+j+1} blue, $x_{i+j-1}x_ix_{i+j+1}x_{i+1}xx_{i+j-1}$ would be a blue C_5, whence x_ix_{i+j-1} or x_ix_{i+j+1} is red. Thus

$$x_ix_{i+j-1}x_{i+j-2} \cdots x_{i+1}x_{i-1}x_{i-2} \cdots x_{i+j}xx_i$$

or

$$x_ix_{i+j+1}x_{i+j+2} \cdots x_{i-1}x_{i+1}x_{i+2} \cdots x_{i+j}xx_i,$$

respectively, is a red C_{n+1}, contrary to the hypothesis. □

We can now prove Proposition 3.10.

Proof of Proposition 3.10. We may assume $|G| \geq 8$. Since $R(C_4, C_5) = 7$, G contains a red C_4. We shall prove the following:

Claim 1. *If C is a red cycle of maximal length, then $|G - V(C)| \leq 2$.*

Now, if $|G - V(C)| = 0$, then, by Lemma 3.11, G contains a red $C_{|G|-1}$ or a red $C_{|G|-2}$. In the former case, we also have a red $C_{|G|-2}$, by Lemma 3.12. If $|G - V(C)| = 1$, then, by Lemma 3.12, we have a red $C_{|G|-2}$, which is also the case if $|G - V(C)| = 2$. Hence, by Claim 1, we always have a red $C_{|G|-2}$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.12, Proposition 3.10 follows.

It remains to prove Claim 1. Thus, let $C = x_1x_2\cdots x_nx_1$ be a red cycle of maximal length, and let $v_1,\dots,v_k$ be the vertices of $G - V(C)$; assume $k \geq 3$. We shall prove that G contains a red cycle longer than C, whence, in fact, $k \leq 2$.

Assume first that some v_i, say v_1, is red adjacent to at least two vertices of C. By Lemma 3.13, we may assume that v_1x_2 and v_1x_4 are red. Then v_1x_1, v_1x_3, v_1x_5, x_1x_3, and x_3x_5 are blue. We consider three cases:

$n \geq 7$ or $n = 5$: Were v_2 red adjacent either to x_1 and x_3 or to x_3 and x_5, G would contain a red C_{n+2}. It follows from Lemma 3.13 that were v_2 red adjacent to x_1 and x_5, G would contain a red C_{n+1}. Hence, v_2 has at most one red edge to $\{x_1,x_3,x_5\}$, whence we obtain a blue C_5, a contradiction.

$n = 6$: Since G contains no blue C_5, v_2 cannot be blue adjacent to both x_1 and x_5; say that v_2x_5 is red. Then v_2x_6 is blue. Were v_2x_3 red, we would obtain a red C_{n+2}, whence v_2x_3 is blue. Since G contains no blue C_5, v_2x_1 is red. Now, if v_1x_6 is blue, then $v_1x_6v_2x_3x_1v_1$ is a blue C_5, and if v_1x_6 is red, then $v_1x_6x_1v_2x_5x_4x_3x_2v_1$ is a red C_{n+2}, a contradiction.

$n = 4$: It is easily seen that v_2, as well as v_3, has at most one red edge to $\{v_1,x_1,x_3\}$. Were v_2 and v_3 not red adjacent to the same of these three vertices, G would contain a blue C_5, whence this is not the case. Now, if v_2x_2 and v_3x_2 are blue, we obtain a blue C_5, and if either v_2x_2 or v_3x_2 is red, we have a red C_{n+1}, a contradiction.

Assume now that each v_i is red adjacent to at most one vertex of C. Then every three vertices of $G-V(C)$ belong to a common blue C_6 whose vertices alternate between $G - V(C)$ and C. Therefore, a blue edge in $G - V(C)$ would yield a blue C_5, whence all v_iv_j are red. Hence, since G is not blue bipartite, $G[V(C)]$ contains a blue edge x_ix_j. If both x_i and x_j have blue neighbours in $G - V(C)$, then there are $v, v' \in G - V(C)$ and a blue path vx_ix_jv' which extends to a blue C_5. Hence, x_i (say) has only red neighbours in $G - V(C)$. This accounts for all red edges between $G - V(C)$ and C. Therefore, every blue edge in $G[V(C)]$ is incident with x_i. Hence, G is blue bipartite, with parts $(G-V(C))\cup\{x_i\}$ and $G[V(C)-\{x_i\}]$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

4. Proofs of the main results

4.1. **Generalised Ramsey numbers.** In this subsection, we prove Theorem 1.8. The proof consists of a number of propositions, the first of which (Proposition 4.1) takes care of the case $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}_1\cup\mathfrak{C}_2$; the others (Propositions 4.2–4.8) deal with the case $\min(\Gamma_1\cup\Gamma_2) \leq 6$.

In order to state Proposition 4.1, we have to define $\mathfrak{C}_1$ and $\mathfrak{C}_2$. Let $\mathfrak{C}_1$ be the set of all pairs $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ such that at least one of the following conditions holds:

(i) $0 \equiv \gamma^2 \geq \max(6,\gamma_e^1)$ or $\gamma^2 \geq 3\gamma_e^1/2$;
(ii) $\gamma^1 \equiv 1$, $\gamma_e^1 \geq 2\gamma^2$, and either $0 \equiv \gamma^2 \geq 2\gamma^1/3$ or $\gamma^2 \geq \max(4,\gamma^1)$;
(iii) $\gamma^2 > \gamma_e^1$ and $\gamma_e^2 = \gamma^2 + 1$.

Also, let $\mathfrak{C}_2$ be as $\mathfrak{C}_1$, but with the roles of 1 and 2 interchanged in the superscripts.

Proposition 4.1. *Let* $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}_1\cup\mathfrak{C}_2$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)=\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)=\begin{cases}R_{\mathrm{red}}(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2) & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}_1,\\ R_{\mathrm{blue}}(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2) & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}_2.\end{cases}$$

Proof. For each $j\in[4]$, let $\mathfrak{C}^j_{\mathrm{red}}$ consist of all pairs $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}$ such that

$\mathfrak{C}^1_{\mathrm{red}}$: $0\equiv\gamma^2\geq\max(6,\gamma^1_e)$ or $\gamma^2\geq 3\gamma^1_e/2$;
$\mathfrak{C}^2_{\mathrm{red}}$: $0\equiv\gamma^2<\gamma^1$, $1\equiv\gamma^1\leq 3\gamma^2/2$, and $\gamma^1_e\geq 2\gamma^2$;
$\mathfrak{C}^3_{\mathrm{red}}$: $1\equiv\gamma^1\leq\gamma^2\leq\gamma^1_e/2$ and $\gamma^2\geq 4$;
$\mathfrak{C}^4_{\mathrm{red}}$: $\gamma^2>\gamma^1_e$ and $\gamma^2_e=\gamma^2+1$.

Furthermore, let $\mathfrak{C}^j_{\mathrm{blue}}$ be as $\mathfrak{C}^j_{\mathrm{red}}$, but with the roles of 1 and 2 interchanged in the superscripts. It is easily seen that

$$\mathfrak{C}_1=\bigcup_{j=1}^{4}\mathfrak{C}^j_{\mathrm{red}}\quad\text{and}\quad\mathfrak{C}_2=\bigcup_{j=1}^{4}\mathfrak{C}^j_{\mathrm{blue}}.$$

Choose arbitrary sets $\Phi\subseteq\mathcal{C}_{\geq n}$, $\Psi\subseteq\mathcal{C}_{\geq k}$, $\Phi_0\subseteq\mathcal{C}_{\geq 2k}$, $\Psi_0\subseteq\mathcal{C}_{\geq 2n}$, and $\Omega\subseteq\mathcal{C}_o$, where $n\geq k\geq 3$. Observe that Colouring 4 contains no red member of Φ and no blue member of $\Psi\cup\Omega$. By (1.1) and the upper bounds in Theorem 1.2, we therefore conclude that

$$R(\{C_n\}\cup\Phi,\{C_k\}\cup\Psi\cup\Omega)=n+k/2-1\quad\text{if } (n,k)\in\Delta_1. \tag{4.1}$$

By considering Colourings 5 and 6 in the same way, we also obtain

$$R(\{C_n\}\cup\Phi_0\cup\Omega,\{C_k\}\cup\Psi)=2k-1\quad\text{if } (n,k)\in\Delta_2 \tag{4.2}$$

and

$$R(\{C_n\}\cup\Phi,\{C_k\}\cup\Psi_0\cup\Omega)=2n-1\quad\text{if } (n,k)\in\Delta_3. \tag{4.3}$$

Now, taking $n=\gamma^1$ and $k=\gamma^2_e$ in (4.1), and $n=\gamma^1$ and $k=\gamma^2$ in (4.2) and (4.3), yields

$$R(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)=\begin{cases}\gamma^1+\gamma^2_e/2-1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^1_{\mathrm{blue}},\\ 2\gamma^2-1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^2_{\mathrm{red}},\\ 2\gamma^1-1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^3_{\mathrm{blue}}.\end{cases}$$

Hence, by symmetry,

$$R(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)=\begin{cases}\gamma^2+\gamma^1_e/2-1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^1_{\mathrm{red}},\\ 2\gamma^1-1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^2_{\mathrm{blue}},\\ 2\gamma^2-1 & \text{if } (\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^3_{\mathrm{red}}.\end{cases}$$

Thus, if $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^1_{\mathrm{red}}\cup\mathfrak{C}^2_{\mathrm{red}}\cup\mathfrak{C}^3_{\mathrm{red}}$, then $R(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)=R_{\mathrm{red}}(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)$, and if $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^1_{\mathrm{blue}}\cup\mathfrak{C}^2_{\mathrm{blue}}\cup\mathfrak{C}^3_{\mathrm{blue}}$, then $R(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)=R_{\mathrm{blue}}(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)$; now apply (3.1).

Consider now $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^4_{\mathrm{red}}\cup\mathfrak{C}^4_{\mathrm{blue}}$; without loss of generality, assume that $(\Gamma_1,\Gamma_2)\in\mathfrak{C}^4_{\mathrm{blue}}$. In order to simplify notation, let $n=\gamma^1$ and $k=\gamma^2_e$. By Lemma 3.4,

$$R(\mathcal{C}_{\geq n},\mathcal{C}_{\geq n}\cup\{C_k\})\leq n+k/2-1.$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.5,

$$R(\{C_n, C_{n+1}\}, \{C_n, C_{n+1}\} \cup \{C_k\}) \leq n + k/2 - 1.$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.6,

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R(\{C_n, C_{n+1}\}, \{C_k\}) \leq n + k/2 - 1.$$

Since, by Proposition 3.2, $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = n + k/2 - 1$, and $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq \mathfrak{m} \leq R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, this completes the proof. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* C_3 *or* $C_4 \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$. *Then*

$$\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = 5$$

and

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \begin{cases} 5 & \text{if } C_3 \text{ and } C_5 \in \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2, \\ 6 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Corollary 3.3, $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = 5$. Hence, by (3.1), $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq 5$. By (1.1) and since $R(C_3, C_3) = R(C_4, C_4) = 6$, $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq 6$.

If $C_3 \notin \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, then Colouring 2 shows that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq 6$, and if $C_5 \notin \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, then Colouring 3 shows that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq 6$. Thus, from now on, assume that both C_3 and C_5 belong to $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$; without loss of generality, assume that $C_3 \in \Gamma_1$. We have to show that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq 5$.

$C_3 \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$: It is well known and easy to verify that Colouring 3 is the only red-blue graph on 5 vertices without monochromatic 3-cycles, and it contains a red C_5 and a blue C_5.

$C_4 \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$: Let G be an arbitrary red-blue graph on 5 vertices, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Were each vertex of G incident with exactly two edges of each colour, we would obtain a red C_5 and a blue C_5, whence some vertex of G is incident with at least three edges of the same colour. Since G contains no red C_3, it follows that G contains a blue C_3, say $C = x_1x_2x_3x_1$; let v_1 and v_2 be the vertices of $G - V(C)$. Since G contains no monochromatic C_4, we may assume that v_1 is red adjacent to x_1 and x_3, but blue adjacent to x_2, while v_2 is red adjacent to x_2 and x_3, but blue adjacent to x_1. Now, if v_1v_2 is red, then $v_1v_2x_3v_1$ is a red C_3, and if v_1v_2 is blue, then $v_1v_2x_1x_2v_1$ is a blue C_4, contrary to the hypothesis. □

Proposition 4.3. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $C_4 \in \Gamma_1 \not\ni C_3$ *and* $C_3 \in \Gamma_2 \not\ni C_4$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } C_6 \in \Gamma_2, \\ 7 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The values of $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ follow from Corollary 3.3. Hence, by (3.1),

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \begin{cases} 6 & \text{if } C_6 \in \Gamma_2, \\ 7 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now turn to the upper bounds. By (1.1), $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R(C_4, C_3) = 7$. Thus, from now on, assume that $C_6 \in \Gamma_2$. We have to show that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq 6$. Thus, let G be an arbitrary red-blue graph on 6 vertices, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Since $R(C_3, C_3) = R(C_4, C_4) = 6$, G contains a red C_3 and a blue C_4, say $C = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_1$; let v_1 and v_2 be the vertices of

$G - V(C)$. Then x_1x_3 and x_2x_4 are red, and, without loss of generality, either (1) $v_1v_2x_4v_1$ or (2) $v_2x_2x_4v_2$ is a red C_3.

Case 1. Since G contains no red C_4, x_2v_1 is blue, since G contains no blue C_3, x_3v_1 is red, and since G contains no red C_4, x_3v_2 is blue. Now, if x_2v_2 is red, then $x_2v_2v_1x_4x_2$ is a red C_4, and if x_2v_2 is blue, then $x_2v_2x_3x_2$ is a blue C_3, contrary to the hypothesis.

Case 2. Since G contains no red C_4, either v_1x_2 or v_1x_4 is blue. In either case, v_1x_1 and v_1x_3 are red (since G contains no blue C_3). Thus $C_{(1)} = x_1v_1x_3x_1$ and $C_{(2)} = x_2v_2x_4x_2$ are red 3-cycles. Since G contains no red C_4, at most one of the edges between $C_{(1)}$ and $C_{(2)}$ is red, whence G contains a blue C_6, contrary to the hypothesis. □

Proposition 4.4. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $\gamma^1 \geq 5$ *and* $\gamma^2 = 3$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2).$$

Proof. Put $n = \gamma^1$. Since $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, it suffices to prove that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$. Thus, let G be an arbitrary red-blue graph on $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ vertices, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Then G contains an odd blue cycle. Let $C = x_1x_2 \cdots x_{2k+1}x_1$ be a shortest odd blue cycle in G; note that $k \geq 2$. Were some chord of C blue, G would contain an odd blue cycle shorter than C, whence all chords of C are red.

We now show that G contains a red C_n, contrary to the hypothesis. If $2k + 1 \leq n$, let U be an n-subset of $V(G)$ such that $G[U]$ contains C. Then $G[U]$ is not blue bipartite, whence, by Lemma 3.7, $G[U]$ contains a red C_n. On the other hand, if $2k + 1 > n$, then, by Lemma 3.8, $G[V(C)]$ contains a red C_n. □

Proposition 4.5. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $\gamma^1 \geq 5$ *and* $\gamma^2 = 4$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2).$$

Proof. If $\gamma^1 \geq 6$, then $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}^1_{\text{blue}}$, and if $\gamma^1 = 5$ and $\gamma^1_e = 6$, then $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}^4_{\text{blue}}$, as defined in the proof of Proposition 4.1. Hence, if $\gamma^1 \geq 6$ or $\gamma^1_e = 6$, the result follows from Proposition 4.1. Otherwise, $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \mathfrak{m} = 7$, by Corollary 3.3. Since $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R(C_5, C_4) = 7$, this completes the proof. □

Proposition 4.6. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $\gamma^1 = \gamma^2 = 5$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \begin{cases} 7 & \text{if } \max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) = 6, \\ 8 & \text{if } \max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) = 8, \\ 9 & \text{if } \max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) \geq 10. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The values of $\mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ follow from Corollary 3.3. Hence, by (3.1),

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \begin{cases} 7 & \text{if } \max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) = 6, \\ 8 & \text{if } \max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) = 8, \\ 9 & \text{if } \max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) \geq 10. \end{cases}$$

We now turn to the upper bounds. By (1.1), $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R(C_5, C_5) = 9$. We show that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq 7$ if $\max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) = 6$. To show that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq 8$ if $\max(\gamma^1_e, \gamma^2_e) \leq 8$ requires more work, but the techniques are similar.

Let G be an arbitrary red-blue graph on 7 vertices, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Since $R(C_4, C_4) = 6$, G contains a monochromatic C_4; say that $C = x_1x_2x_3x_4x_1$ is a blue C_4, and let v_1, v_2, and v_3 be the vertices of $G - V(C)$. Since G contains no blue C_5, each v_i is red adjacent to two opposite vertices of C. Without loss of generality, assume that v_1 and v_2 are red adjacent to x_1 and x_3.

Since G contains no red C_5, v_3 is blue adjacent to two opposite vertices of the red C_4 $v_1x_1v_2x_3v_1$. Thus, (1) v_3x_1 and v_3x_3 are red, in which case v_3v_1 and v_3v_2 are blue, (2) v_3x_2 and v_3x_4 are red, and v_3x_1 and v_3x_3 are blue, or (3) v_3x_2 and v_3x_4 are red, and v_3v_1 and v_3v_2 are blue. Note that Cases 1 and 2 are symmetric with respect to colour interchange. Thus we only have to consider Cases 1 and 3. In either case, were v_1x_2 and v_2x_4 blue, $v_1x_2x_1x_4v_2v_3v_1$ would be a blue C_6, whence at least one of them is red, say v_1x_2.

Case 1. Were x_2v_2 red, $x_2v_2x_1v_3x_3v_1x_2$ would be a red C_6, whence x_2v_2 is blue. Hence, were x_4v_3 blue, $x_4v_3v_2x_2x_1x_4$ would be a blue C_5, whence x_4v_3 is red. Now, if x_4v_1 is red, then $x_4v_1x_1v_2x_3v_3x_4$ is a red C_6, and if x_4v_1 is blue, then $x_4v_1v_3v_2x_2x_1x_4$ is a blue C_6, contrary to the hypothesis.

Case 3. Were x_4v_2 red, $x_4v_2x_1v_1x_2v_3x_4$ would be a red C_6, whence x_4v_2 is blue. Now, if x_1v_3 is red, then $x_1v_3x_2v_1x_3v_2x_1$ is a red C_6, and if x_1v_3 is blue, then $x_1v_3v_2x_4x_3x_2x_1$ is a blue C_6, contrary to the hypothesis. □

Proposition 4.7. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $\gamma^1 \geq 6$ *and* $\gamma^2 = 5$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2).$$

Proof. Put $n = \gamma^1$. Since $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, it suffices to prove that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$. Thus, let G be an arbitrary red-blue graph on $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ vertices, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Then G contains an odd blue cycle. Furthermore, by Proposition 3.2, $|G| \geq n + 2$. Hence, it follows from Proposition 3.10 that G contains a red C_n, contrary to the hypothesis. □

Proposition 4.8. *Let* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ *with* $\gamma^1 \geq 6$ *and* $\gamma^2 = 6$. *Then*

$$R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \mathfrak{m}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2).$$

Proof. If $\gamma^1 \neq 7$, then $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}^1_{\text{blue}}$, if $\gamma^1 = 7$ and $\gamma^1_e \geq 12$, then $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}^2_{\text{red}}$, and if $\gamma^1 = 7$ and $\gamma^1_e = 8$, then $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}^4_{\text{blue}}$, as defined in the proof of Proposition 4.1. Hence, if $(\gamma^1, \gamma^1_e) \neq (7, 10)$, the result follows from Proposition 4.1. Otherwise, $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \mathfrak{m} = 10$, by Corollary 3.3, whence we have to show that $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \leq 10$. Thus, let G be an arbitrary red-blue graph on 10 vertices, and assume G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding.

Since $R(C_8, C_6) = 10$, G contains a red C_8, say $C = x_1y_3x_2y_4x_3y_1x_4y_2x_1$; let $X = \{x_i\}$ and $Y = \{y_i\}$, and let v_1 and v_2 be the vertices of $G - V(C)$. Since G contains no red C_7, $x_1x_2x_3x_4x_1$ and $y_1y_2y_3y_4y_1$ are blue 4-cycles. Either all edges between X and Y are red, or at least one of them, say x_1y_1, is blue. In the latter case, x_2y_2, x_3y_3, and x_4y_4 are red (since G contains no blue C_6). Hence, in either case, x_1x_3, x_2x_4, y_1y_3, and y_2y_4 are blue (since G contains no red C_7). Therefore, two disjoint blue edges between X and Y would yield a blue C_6, whence all blue edges between X and Y have a common vertex, which we may assume is x_1.

Were some v_j red adjacent to both X and Y (i.e., to at least one vertex in X and at least one vertex in Y), G would contain a red C_7, and if both v_1 and v_2 were blue adjacent to either all x_i or all y_i, G would contain a blue C_6. Hence, we may assume that v_1 is blue adjacent to all x_i while v_2 is blue adjacent to all y_i. Now, if v_1v_2 is red, then, since v_2 is red adjacent to X and v_1 is red adjacent to Y, we obtain a red C_{10}. On the other hand, if v_1v_2 is blue, then if v_2 is blue adjacent to X or v_1 is blue adjacent to Y, we obtain a blue C_6, and if v_2 is red adjacent to all x_i and v_1 is red adjacent to all y_i, we obtain a red C_{10}, contrary to the hypothesis. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. The first claim follows from (3.1) and Proposition 4.2, and the second claim is an immediate consequence of Propositions 4.1–4.8. □

4.2. **Structural results.** The main goal of this subsection is to state and prove Theorem 4.11, the unabridged version of Theorem 1.13. We first prove that many (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding graphs, not only critical ones, have to be blue bipartite.

Proposition 4.9. *Given $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$ and a (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding graph G, assume that either*

$$\gamma^1 \geq 5,\ \gamma^2 = 3,\ \textit{and}\ |G| \geq \gamma^1$$

or

$$\gamma^1 \geq 6,\ \gamma^2 = 5,\ \textit{and}\ |G| \geq \gamma^1 + 2.$$

Then G is blue bipartite.

Proof. In order to obtain a contradiction, suppose that G is not blue bipartite, and let $n = \gamma^1$.

Assume first that $n \geq 5$, $\gamma^2 = 3$, and $|G| \geq n$, and let C be a shortest odd blue cycle in G. Then it follows, in the same way as in the proof of Proposition 4.4, that G contains a red C_n, contrary to the (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoidance of G. Thus G is blue bipartite.

Assume now that $n \geq 6$, $\gamma^2 = 5$, and $|G| \geq n + 2$. Then it follows from Proposition 3.10 that G contains a red C_n. Thus G is blue bipartite. □

We find this surprising, since $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ can be much larger than γ^1 and $\gamma^1 + 2$. For instance (with γ^1 and γ^2 as in Proposition 4.9), $R(C_{\gamma^1}, C_{\gamma^2}) = 2\gamma^1 - 1$. Hence, even if $|G|$ is only about half the Ramsey number, G has to be blue bipartite in order to avoid both a red C_{γ^1} and a blue C_{γ^2}.

Note that if $(\gamma_2, \gamma_e^2) = (5, 6)$, then $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \gamma^1 + 2$, whence Proposition 4.9 does not tell us anything. This is why in Theorem 4.11, we require that $\gamma_e^2 \geq 8$.

The next result characterises all (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding, blue bipartite graphs on the maximum number of vertices, for any sets of cycles.

Proposition 4.10. *Given $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$, let G be a blue bipartite graph on $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) - 1$ vertices; say that $G_{\text{blue}} \subseteq K_{p,q}$, where $p + q = |G|$ and $p \geq q$, and let $n = \gamma^1$ and $k = \gamma_e^2$.*

If $2n > k$ and $(n, k) \neq (3, 4)$, then G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding if and only if either

(1) $p = n-1$, $q = k/2-1$, *and all red edges (if any) between* K_{n-1} *and* $K_{k/2-1}$ *are incident with a common vertex in* K_{n-1},

or

(2) $p = n-2$, $q = k/2$, *there is a vertex* $x \in K_{k/2}$ *such that there are* $n-3$ *or* $n-2$ *red edges between* x *and* K_{n-2}, *and all other edges between* K_{n-2} *and* $K_{k/2}$ *are blue.*

If $2n \le k$ *or* $(n,k) = (3,4)$, *then* G *is* (Γ_1, Γ_2)*-avoiding if and only if* $p = q = n-1$ *and, moreover, if* $n \ge 4$, *there is at most one red edge between the two* K_{n-1}, *while if* $n = 3$, *there are zero (only possible if* $k \ge 6$*), one, or two disjoint (only possible if* $\gamma_e^1 \ge 6$*) red edges between the two* K_2.

Proof. It is easily seen that the above conditions are sufficient for G to be (Γ_1, Γ_2)-avoiding. Hence, we have to prove that they are necessary.

$2n > k$ and $(n,k) \neq (3,4)$: We have $|G| = R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) - 1 = n + k/2 - 2$. Were $p \ge n$, G would contain a red C_n, whence either (1) $p = n-1$ and $q = k/2-1$, or (2) $p \le n-2$ and $q \ge k/2$.

Case 1. Were there two disjoint red edges between K_{n-1} and $K_{k/2-1}$, G would contain a red C_n (since $n \ge 4$), whence all red edges between K_{n-1} and $K_{k/2-1}$ have a common vertex x. Either $x \in K_{k/2-1}$ and there is at most one red edge between x and K_{n-1}, or $x \in K_{n-1}$ and there are up to $k/2-1$ red edges between x and $K_{k/2-1}$.

Case 2. Were G blue complete bipartite, G would contain a blue C_k, whence there is at least one red edge between K_p and K_q. As in Case 1, all red edges between K_p and K_q have a common vertex x. Since G contains no blue C_k, $p = n-2$, $q = k/2$, $x \in K_{k/2}$, and there are $n-3$ or $n-2$ red edges between x and K_{n-2}.

$2n \le k$ or $(n,k) = (3,4)$: In this case, $|G| = 2n-2$. Were $p \ge n$, G would contain a red C_n, whence $p = q = n-1$. Since G contains no red C_n, no vertex is incident with more than one red edge between the two K_{n-1}. Therefore, if $n \ge 4$, then there is at most one red edge between the two K_{n-1}. On the other hand, if $n = 3$, then zero red edges is impossible if $k = 4$, and two disjoint red edges is impossible if $\gamma_e^1 = 4$. □

Observe that if $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ (as is the case in Theorem 4.11), then Proposition 4.10 characterises all (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs that are blue bipartite. On the other hand, if $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) < R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$, then no (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graph is blue bipartite. In this case, if Conjecture 1.11 is true and unless $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathscr{C}$ (as defined above Theorem 1.8), then there is a red bipartite, (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graph, and the obvious "red bipartite version" of Proposition 4.10 characterises all of them.

We can now state and prove the unabridged version of Theorem 1.13.

Theorem 4.11. *Given* $(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{C}$, *let* $n = \gamma^1$ *and* $k = \gamma_e^2$, *and assume that either*

$$n \ge 5 \text{ and } \gamma^2 = 3 \tag{4.4}$$

or

$$n \ge 6,\ \gamma^2 = 5, \text{ and } k \ge 8. \tag{4.5}$$

Then G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical if and only if $G_{\text{blue}} \subseteq K_{p,q}$, where $p+q = |G|$ and $p \geq q$, and, moreover, if $2n > k$, either (1) *or* (2) *in Proposition 4.10 holds, while if $2n \leq k$, $p = q = n-1$ and there is at most one red edge between the two K_{n-1}.*

Proof. Since either (4.4) or (4.5) holds, $R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$. As noted above, Proposition 4.10 therefore characterises all (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs that are blue bipartite. However, if (4.4) holds, then $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \gamma^1 + 1$, so if G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical, then $|G| = R(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) - 1 \geq \gamma^1$. Similarly, if (4.5) holds, then $R_{\text{blue}}(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) \geq \gamma^1 + 3$, so if G is (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical, then $|G| \geq \gamma^1 + 2$. Hence, by Proposition 4.9, all (Γ_1, Γ_2)-critical graphs are blue bipartite. This completes the proof. □

As noted in the introduction, Corollary 1.14 is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.11.

We end this paper with some comments regarding star-critical Ramsey numbers.

Given a graph G and a subgraph H of G, let $G - H$ be the subgraph of G obtained by deleting the edges of H. The *star-critical Ramsey number* $r_*(G_1, G_2)$ was introduced by Hook and Isaak [6, 7]. It is the smallest integer k such that each red-blue colouring of the edges of $K_n - K_{1,n-1-k}$, where $n = R(G_1, G_2)$, contains a red copy of G_1 or a blue copy of G_2. That is, it describes the largest star whose edges can be removed from K_n so that the resulting subgraph is still forced to contain a red G_1 or a blue G_2.

Let Δ be the set of all pairs (n, k) of integers such that $n \geq k \geq 3$, k is odd, and $(n, k) \neq (3, 3)$. Zhang, Broersma, and Chen [11] recently proved the following:

Theorem 4.12 ([11, Theorem 4])**.** *Let $(n, k) \in \Delta$. Then $r_*(C_n, C_k) = n+1$.*

The lower bound in Theorem 4.12 follows from an easy construction. The proof of the upper bound, on the other hand, is more complicated. We observe that the upper bound follows easily from Corollary 1.14 in the special cases $k = 3$ with $n \geq 5$, and $k = 5$ with $n \geq 6$. We demonstrate this when $k = 3$; the proof when $k = 5$ is completely analogous.

Let $r = R(C_n, C_3) = 2n - 1$. We have to show that every colouring of $G = K_r - K_{1,r-1-(n+1)} = K_{2n-1} - K_{1,n-3}$ contains a red C_n or a blue C_3. Let v be the centre vertex of the star $K_{1,n-3}$, and put $H = K_{2n-1} - v$ (so H is a K_{2n-2}). Since $(2n-2) - (n-3) = n+1$, v is adjacent to $n+1$ vertices of H. Colour G arbitrarily, and assume G becomes (C_n, C_3)-avoiding. By Corollary 1.14, $H_{\text{blue}} = K_{n-1,n-1}$ or $K_{n-1,n-1} - e$ for some edge e. Since G contains no red C_n, v has at most one red edge to each red K_{n-1}. Hence, v has at least $(n+1) - 2 = n - 1$ blue edges. Now, if all blue edges go to the same red K_{n-1}, we obtain a red C_n, and if not, we obtain a blue C_3, contrary to the hypothesis. Thus, $r_*(C_n, C_3) \leq n + 1$.

In fact, for all pairs $(n, k) \in \Delta$ such that G is (C_n, C_k)-critical if and only if $G_{\text{blue}} = K_{n-1,n-1}$ or $K_{n-1,n-1} - e$ for some edge e (see Question 1.15), a completely analogous argument proves the upper bound in Theorem 4.12.

Acknowledgements

The author wants to thank Jörgen Backelin for valuable comments and discussions, and Axel Hultman and Stanisław P. Radziszowski for comments which much improved the presentation.

References

1. J. A. Bondy, *Pancyclic graphs. I*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **11** (1971), 80–84.
2. R. Diestel, *Graph theory*, fourth ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 173, Springer, Heidelberg, 2010.
3. P. Erdős, R. J. Faudree, C. C. Rousseau, and R. H. Schelp, *On cycle-complete graph Ramsey numbers*, J. Graph Theory **2** (1978), 53–64.
4. R. J. Faudree and R. H. Schelp, *All Ramsey numbers for cycles in graphs*, Discrete Math. **8** (1974), 313–329.
5. ———, *Some problems in Ramsey theory*, Theory and applications of graphs (Proc. Internat. Conf., Western Mich. Univ., Kalamazoo, Mich., 1976), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 642, Springer, Berlin, 1978, pp. 500–515.
6. J. Hook, *The classification of critical graphs and star-critical Ramsey numbers*, Ph.D. thesis, Lehigh University, 2010.
7. J. Hook and G. Isaak, *Star-critical Ramsey numbers*, Discrete Appl. Math. **159** (2011), 328–334.
8. G. Károlyi and V. Rosta, *Generalized and geometric Ramsey numbers for cycles*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **263** (2001), 87–98.
9. V. Rosta, *On a Ramsey-type problem of J. A. Bondy and P. Erdős. I & II*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **15** (1973), 94–120.
10. Y. Wu, Y. Sun, and S. P. Radziszowski, *Wheel and star-critical Ramsey numbers for quadrilateral*, Discrete Appl. Math. **186** (2015), 260–271.
11. Y. Zhang, H. Broersma, and Y. Chen, *On star-critical and upper size Ramsey numbers*, Discrete Appl. Math. **202** (2016), 174–180.

Department of Mathematics, Linköping University, SE-581 83 Linköping, Sweden

E-mail address: mikael.hansson@liu.se